

## 11<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Online Journalism: April 2010

### Day 2, Panel 4 - Research Panel: What is behind the news? Format, consumption and the business models examined

#### **Moderator/Chair:**

**Iris Chyi**, University of Texas at Austin

#### **Panelists:**

**Geoffrey M. Graybeal** and **Jameson L. Hayes**, University of Georgia, *All The News That's Fit To Pay For Online: The Case for a Modified News Micropayment Model on the Social Web*

**Angela M. Lee** and **Michael X. Delli Carpini**, University of Pennsylvania, *News Consumption Revisited: Examining the Power of Habits in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

**Seth Lewis**, University of Texas at Austin, *The Logic of Journalism Innovation: The Case of the Knight News Challenge*

**Juliette de Maeyer**, University of Brussels (Belgium), *Methods for Mapping Hyperlink Networks: Examining the Environment of Belgian News Websites*

**Nuno Vargas**, University of Barcelona (Spain), *From the Pixel to the Grid and Back*

**Rodney Benson**, **Matthew Powers**, **Sandra Vera**, **Ida Willig** and **Mark Orsten**, New York University, *Is the Internet "Europeanizing" or "Americanizing" Global Journalism? An Analysis of the Form of Online and Print Newspapers in Denmark, France, and the U.S.*

---

**Note: Matt Thompson, from the previous panel, presents his Epic 2015 Movie at the beginning of this panel.**

---

#### **Epic 2015 Movie:**

**Narrator:** *It is the best of times. It is the worst of times. In the year 2015, people have access to a breadth and depth of information unimaginable in an earlier age. Everyone contributes in some way, participating to create a living, breathing mediascape. However, the press as you know it has ceased to exist. The Fourth Estate's fortunes have waned. Twentieth century news organizations are an afterthought, a lonely remnant of a not too distant past.*

*The road to 2015 began in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1989, Tim Berners-Lee, a computer scientist at the CERN Particle Physics Laboratory in Switzerland, invents the World Wide Web.*

*Amazon.com is founded in 1994. Its young creator dreams of a store that sells everything. Amazon's model, which will come to set the standard for internet sales, is built on automated, personalized recommendations—a store that can make suggestions.*

*In 1998, two Stanford programmers unleash Google. Their algorithm echoes the logic of Amazon. It treats links as recommendations, and from that foundation, powers the world's fastest and most effective search engine.*

*In 1999, a dot-com startup named Pyra Labs unveils Blogger, a personal publishing tool.*

*Friendster arrives on the scene in 2002, and hundreds of thousands of young people rush to populate it with an incredibly detailed catalog of their lives, their interests, and their social networks. Also in 2002, Google launches Google News, a portal featuring headlines and links to the stories of the minute. Journalist organizations cry "Foul!" Google News is edited entirely by computers.*

*In 2003, Google buys Blogger.*

*2004 would be remembered as the year that everything began. Reason Magazine sends subscribers an issue with a satellite photo of their houses on the cover and information custom-tailored to each subscriber inside. Google unveils Gmail with a gigabyte of free space for every user. Microsoft launches Newsbot, a social news filter. Google buys Picasa, a tool for organizing images. Amazon releases A9, a search engine built on Google's technology that also incorporates Amazon's trademark recommendations. And then, in August, Google goes public. Awash in new capital, it acquires Keyhole, a company that maps the world and puts it online. Google also begins digitizing and indexing the world's libraries. Apple's iPod inspires podcasting, and the age of personal radio begins. We can all broadcast our own thoughts, our own music, directly to each other's music players.*

*2005—In response to Google's recent moves, Microsoft buys Friendster. Apple releases the wifiPod, a portable media player with integrated camera that can send and receive podcasts and images on the go.*

*2006—Google combines all of its services into the Google Grid, a universal platform that provides a functionally limitless amount of disk space and bandwidth to store and share media of all kinds. Each user selects her own level of privacy. She can store her content securely on the Google Grid or publish it for all to see. It has never been easier for people to make their lives part of the media landscape.*

*2007—Microsoft responds to Google’s mounting challenge with Newsbotster, a social news network and participatory journalism platform. Newsbotster ranks and sorts news based on what each user’s friends and colleagues are reading and viewing, and it allows everyone to comment on what they see.*

*2008 sees the alliance that will challenge Microsoft’s ambitions: Google and Amazon join forces forming Googlezon. Google supplies the Google Grid and unparalleled search technology; Amazon supplies the social recommendation engine and its huge commercial infrastructure. Together, they use their detailed knowledge of every user’s social network, demographics, buying habits, and reading interests to provide total customization of content and advertising. This year, The New York Times switches to a paid subscription model online. However, its content stream remains open to Googlezon’s index and computers.*

*The news wars of 2010 are notable for the fact that no actual news organizations take part. Googlezon and Microsoft face off, enhancing their services week by week. Googlezon finally checkmates Microsoft with a feature the software giant cannot match. Using new algorithms, Googlezon’s computers screen stories for names, places, images, and other contextual cues, isolating facts from quotes and turning statistics into flexible equations. Then Googlezon re-sorts, recalculates, and recombines these scraps with our information—our blog entries, our photos, our purchases, our lives. Suddenly, news is more relevant than ever before.*

*In 2011, the slumbering Fourth Estate awakes to make its first and final stand. The New York Times Company sues Googlezon claiming that the company’s fact-stripping robots are a violation of copyright law. The case goes all the way to the Supreme Court which on August 4, 2011 decides in favor of Googlezon.*

*On Sunday, March 9, 2014, Googlezon unleashes EPIC. The Evolving Personalized Information Construct is the system by which our sprawling, chaotic mediascape is filtered, ordered, and delivered. Everyone contributes and many people get paid a tiny cut of Googlezon’s immense advertising revenue proportional to the popularity of their contributions. EPIC produces a custom content package for each user using his choices, his consumption habits, his interests, his demographic, his social network, to shape the product. At its best, tailored to its savviest readers, EPIC is a summary of the world, deeper, broader, and more nuanced than anything ever available before. But at its worst, and for too many, EPIC is merely a collection of trivia, much of it untrue, all of it narrow, shallow, and sensational. In 2014, The New York Times goes offline. In feeble protest to Googlezon’s hegemony, The Times becomes a print-only newsletter for the elite and the elderly.*

*2015—Pinki Nankani, a refugee from the defunct New York Times digital edition, finds a new journalistic calling. She begins to collect and filter GPS*

*tagged neighborhood broadcasts. Soon Pinki's feed is a local lodestone and more and more of her neighbors tag their broadcasts with GPS data as they realize they too could be a part of it.*

**Pinki Nankani:** *Hey, it's me. If you're listening, I think a bunch of us are going to go meet up at Progress Park. I think we might do, like, a little barbecue.*

**Man Replies:** *If you're going to the park, do not bother with Main Street. There's this big accident at Garfield and it's all backed up. It's totally a mess, so...*

**Man Replies:** *Have you guys gone out today? If you haven't gone out today, please go out today. It's an incredible day. Take a look at this. [Image of a beautiful blue sky.]*

[Epic 2015 movie concludes.]

**Rosental Calmon Alves:** OK. This is The Epic. [Applause.] This is the man. This is the man! So remember, this is when he and Robin Sloan were fellows at the Poynter Institute in 2004. I think they were playing with Flash or whatever, and they had this [idea] later [in a] bar or whatever, and they had this light to do this thing. And we have been seeing this. Everything until 2004 is reality, right? From 2004 up is fiction. So, how do you update that? And why did you move it from... Because the end, he moved the end, which actually made me very mad. He moved [it], because it was 2014, and it ended with the end of *The New York Times*, and it was very sad. And then he found this woman, Pinki, that survived *The New York Times*, and decided to end up with a blue sky and life is good.

[Laughter.]

**Matt Thompson:** We wanted... [Laughs.] OK. So when we first started presenting it, it actually evolved from this PowerPoint presentation that we were giving to folks at the Poynter Institute. And really, this PowerPoint presentation was not this. It was not a story. It was, "Hey, you guys should be paying attention to what folks like Google and Amazon and Flickr and what-have-you are doing. Their actions border on your world." At the time, I mean, this is sort of late 2003, early 2004. *The New York Times* told the Online Journalism Review, "We actually don't link out. We don't see the value of linking to other websites. People come to our site for everything. We own the world." And so it was a very, very different moment than it is today. People just did not think, like, "Google? Why are you telling me about Google? What does that have to do with journalism and my world?" And that was the essential point that we wanted to make. These things matter for you. They have implications for your universe. And we kept on making this point in this PowerPoint, like saying, you know, "So look, Google made these acquisitions, and you could imagine these things might affect you somehow,

and their revenue models might be interesting for you to look at." And it just people, I mean, they would be interested. They would sort of give us these confused, bemused looks and what-have-you, but just kind of—whoosh—straight over their heads.

So, we decided to say, "OK. Screw it. No longer are we telling you the story of 'This is happening. You should pay attention.' We're saying 'This has happened. You've been cut out in it. Done. What's your response?'" Which was a much more effective message, a much better story. I mean, they started paying attention. Our sessions out of this got a lot better. But initially, the ending was this total dystopic thing. It was, you know, we started all, you know, sort of Charles Dickens. Sunny, if you will. [Dramatic voice] "It is the best of times, it is the worst of times." [Normal voice] But we ended with, yeah, dystopic vision. And the last words of the original movie were, "It doesn't have to be this way." And that would be the point at which Robin and I would march on stage in tin-foil headbands and say, "OK, so how do we avoid this future?" Or, "OK. Given this future, how do you respond? If this has already happened, if this has already been presented as fact, what is the role of your organization in this universe?" And that was a much more productive conversation than like, "So, Google... What? What? Why are you telling me about this?"

Anyway, but at the same time, *everyone* was focused on the sort of... Their initial response [was], while more productive than just, "Why are you showing me this?" it was still kind of, "Oh, now that's depressing. I'm just going to go sulk now." The movie was just a bit too dystopian, we felt, for people to actually take it and do anything with it. We wanted to show a notion of production, a notion of what's good about this universe in which everyone is empowered, in which the news tailors itself to be more relevant to people, and we wanted to engage people with both sides of this. Tell a more nuanced story ultimately. So we decided to end it on a note that's potentially more uplifting, but I think also has murkier implications for people to respond to. And the blue sky. [Laughter.] We needed color at the end of it.

**Rosental Calmon Alves:** Does anybody have any burning questions about this? No questions. OK. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

**Matt Thompson:** Thank you, Rosenthal.

**Rosental Calmon Alves:** And you notice that I was showing the different languages. Do you have any idea how many times this has been viewed? It must be millions, because it has [been shown] in any other language that you can imagine. And people have been showing this after and after. And some of these concepts like the [Google] Grid, you know, I don't think Google had started talking about Cloud computing it in 2003 when you guys

had that deal with something there in that bar in Florida, but anyways. Many things that they forecast there are really happening. So we're going to have an awesome panel now with the great research from everywhere.

**Iris Chyi:** My name is Iris Chyi. I am an assistant professor here in the School of Journalism. I am really excited here to introduce this exciting research panel, which probably will change some of the stereotypes about research, whatever that is. So we have six great papers, and all of the presenters turn out to be doctoral students, which make me feel more senior than usual. The first paper is by Geoffrey Graybeal and Jameson Hayes from the University of Georgia. This is an extremely ambitious paper because they propose a micropayment model for the newspaper industry. And you know that [with] the online, the debates about charging for all online news has been going on for a while. It's not the micropayment model that we heard about ten years ago. It's a modified model that they believe is worth trying. So let's hear from them.

**Geoffrey Graybeal:** It's an honor to be here with you today. We're very excited to be sharing with you our modified news micropayment model, particularly in light of what the industry experts told us yesterday. For those of you that weren't here yesterday, Wilkinson and Mr. Moroney from *The Dallas Morning News* told us that we need a new business model. They also told us that the impression-based advertising is not enough in the future media landscape, and they told us that we need to find a way to get users to pay for news. So we present to you, basically, we start with the assumption that micropayment in and of itself will not work. So what we're presenting to you is a modified news micropayment model that takes into consideration how the web has drastically changed since micropayment first began being discussed back in the 90s. The web, of course, has shifted from one of a semantic web of information to a social web which leverages socialization and sharing. So within that context, that's what we would like to present to you: our modified news micropayment model. I'll let my colleague Jay start us off with that.

**Jameson Hayes:** Hello. Also, thank you for having us. It's funny when you start talking about paying for content, you inevitably split into two factions. Some say, "Never pay for news." Some say, "It's inevitable." And in that conversation, almost always you hear Stuart Brand's line about "information wants to be free." You hardly ever hear the other half of that which says that scarce information wants to be expensive. Now, we don't necessarily agree with the expensive part, but we definitely see day-to-day, as journalists get laid off or newspapers close, that professional quality journalism is becoming scarcer and scarcer. So in that model, perhaps payment is a more viable way to go. So in light of this and seeing all this discussion, you know, last year, we had a reemergence of the age-old debate about micropayment. Namely, Walter Isaacson came out with his "How to Save a Newspaper" piece in TIME [Magazine] and basically proffered micropayment as an option. So we said, "Okay, is this really viable? Let's look at some business models." So we

looked at advertising, we looked at subscription, and we looked at micropayment. We do want to say this—we don't feel like micropayment or the model that we're presenting is a be-all, end-all. We feel that you need all three. You need advertising, you need subscription, and you need micropayment. Also, we want to note here that a business model, when we present this, is not meant to be the step-by-step way, "this is how you do it," because that is the business of the business people. That is their strategy. This is [an] abstract concept for a way we think it could work if we implement it. OK. So we looked at willingness to pay, literature, and marketing behavioral economics and so forth and found that there is evidence that people are more willing to pay than they used to [be]. Now we also looked at SNS literature, and this is because this was the best source of literature for the social web [and] how things operate there. And then after we did that, we also looked at all the huge amounts of research in gossip or chatter in the industry, along with that academic data, and then we come up with what we're going to present to you today. So we have four drivers, and we're going to walk you through them step by step.

First, micro-earn. Notice I said *micro-earn*, not *micro-pay*. In this system, micro-earn would function somewhat like a rewards program. Instead of being asked to pay for an article, you're actually paying for an article, but if you put it out into your social network, you give the access to your social network by doing things like Tweeting the article [or] posting it on Facebook. And then your social network decides, "I want to take your recommendation and read the stuff that you feel is important." Well, then you get a return on that, so you can actually aggregate some points to use for other articles or even to cash out. Great examples of this: gaming industry, hoteling, so forth.

Perhaps the most important part is the socialization and sharing function. If you think about news content, we know it's valuable. People still have value in journalism. The problem is, particularly in the semantic web, until the advent of Twitter and so forth [that] we've recently began to use, we've expected people to come to our sites to get journalism. It just doesn't necessarily work that way anymore. So you have great content, but you have no way to really get it out to people. That's where the social web comes in. They have logistical streams. They have those social networks that have naturally been filled in which these things can be disseminated. So, why not use them? If you look at literature, it says there's three streams that you have to have in an online business model. You have to have value. News has that. You have to have logistics. SNS has that. We're proposing that you use those two to create the third one, which is revenue stream, which is what we all are after, what the lifeblood of any business is. With that, I'll turn it over to Geoff to finish up.

**Geoffrey Graybeal:** Thank you. Our third driver is local focus. Now, by local focus, we mean two things. It's long been the bread and butter of local news for local news outlets. So we would continue to have that be the case

here. Often a local newspaper is going to be [a] reporter is going to be the only one sitting at the local school board meeting, for example. So it harnesses that local news content still, where you're providing unique content that no one else in your community is providing. The other thing we mean by local focus here is the ability for each individual newspaper in the ecosystem to retain its pricing decisions, to retain its pricing points. So the willingness-to-pay literature from the marketing realm indicates that the way that you can influence willingness to pay is to move the pricing point from beyond dollars and cents to foreign currency, if you will. So our model allows for the individual newspapers to retain and set the pricing that they wish to do so, along the lines of *New York Times* could have "*Times Tender*" and could set the price for however many *Times Tenders* you get, and you purchase articles along the lines of *Times Tender*. *The Wall Street Journal* could have "*Wall Street Journal Bucks*," *The Courant* could have "*Courant Currency*." So you allow the individual newspaper to retain their pricing structure, and they can be literal dollars and cents or they can be this foreign currency that they determine, much like the Nintendo Wii does that now with Wii points. You pay \$10 and you get like 100 Wii points, for example. So when you are making that transaction as a consumer, you're not thinking of it as one cent, you're thinking of it as in whatever that local pricing point is. So the key there is that news outlets individually can retain their pricing decisions with that, while focusing on hyper-local content that's long been the bread and butter of the news industry and newspapers, in particular. As it is now, I pay a different price for *The New York Times* than I do for *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, and I pay a different price for *The Clayton Tribune*, which is a small newspaper in Georgia.

The other fourth driver that we have here is a centralized banking system. So you need a place, that if newspapers are having their own individual currency, that you can swap out this foreign currency and exchange it for real cash or for other currencies. There was an existing system called Bodega Bills that do this now in the virtual gaming realm, and many models already exist that already support this. Last fall, the Newspaper Association of America requested information and a proposal from Google for their checkout model. Now Google submitted a micropayment option in its Google Checkout and PayPal, of course, is an existing platform where transactions take place and you can exchange money and that sort of thing. Also, Gordon Krovitz, the former publisher of *The Wall Street Journal* is a principle in Journalism Online, LLC. It's really new. In the last few months, they've been going in beta with their Press+ System. Now that also would have the flexibility or possibility as they line up a variety of industry partners to serve as the centralized banking system. So there's some existing models out there that could serve the purpose of the centralized banking system. However, we feel that's a key driver in our model.

Now, I apologize that I don't have a pointer, but you can look at the paper. This is basically—it's not showing up too well—but this is a graphic illustration of the model. And we'll use a hypothetical reader that we'll call "Jonathan

Jones" to illustrate the model. Jonathan Jones subscribes to *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, and *The Courant*, his local newspaper. And he has a young daughter named Hannah, who is seven years old, who loves the Nintendo Wii. So Jonathan Jones is an avid reader of those. He regularly engages in purchases and reads articles on all of these sites. He then shares them in his trusted network of friends who trust his recommendation, because now in this new framework, news industries have indicated that they're going to start charging for content and put it behind a pay wall. So now, how do I know whether I want to read something? I'm using the recommendations from my trusted friends that I've found through social networking. So when Jonathan recommends something to me, I'm going to read it, he's going to get a micro-credit back. Maybe if ten people click on and purchase an article he has recommended, he'll get a free article or a free *Times* Tender from his local paper. He then wants to take all the currency and capital that he's built up from being an avid reader of these news sites that he's collected, cash it out at the central banking mechanism or convert it to Wii points and buy Mario Kart for his daughter. So you see how it can sort of function—the ability to micro-pay, micro-earn, the central banking mechanism, and the different local pricing points. And of course I'll be happy to answer your questions at the end of the presentation in more detail about this.

Overall, in terms of discussion, we believe our model has a number of implications. First, it literally makes news a hot commodity. It makes online news something that can be bought, sold, and traded, in the sense of shared, and it leverages social capital. It restores that value that Mr. Wilkinson was discussing yesterday—the need for newspapers to have value in its online news content. So we believe those are a few implications. We also believe there's a number of directions for future research. One such being, first of all, we would like to find industry partners to test out the model in various communities to see if it works on some level. The next thing is, this is a journalism symposium, so we're presenting to you here a modified news micropayment model. On the first day, we heard from Mr. Kydd from Demand Media, who is also working on a sustainable model for media that's not journalism—entertainment, for example, YouTube videos. We believe that our model would also work and have currency and applicability to broader media content, including entertainment, so we believe a future direction is to explore a modified media micropayment model. And then others in the literature, particularly a gentleman named Mr. Smith, has referred to mobile as the Holy Grail for micropayment. Many users, many people have already given up hope that we will ever be able to influence consumers and readers to pay for news content online. However, we're already naturally used to paying for content on the mobile phone, downloading ring tones and so forth and so on. So we believe that there is a possibility for a modified mobile news micropayment model as well in the future.

That concludes my comments. I do look forward to your questions and continuing this conversation both here in person and online, where you can read our paper online and also look at my website, [GeoffreyGraybeal.com](http://GeoffreyGraybeal.com). Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

**Iris Chyi:** Thank you. In their paper they mentioned this micro-earning element, which reminded me of this earn credit feature that David Cohn talked about this morning. So I think in this give-and-take thing, you have to probably give first and then take later. Okay, next, we have Angela Lee from the University of Pennsylvania. She's going to talk about the force of habit in news consumption.

**Angela Lee:** Thank you for having me. I'm really happy to be here today. So among the first wave of online journalism studies, there has been optimism, in that the Internet is going to transform news information, that it's going to liberate news information. So the question becomes, How does the internet do that? How does it democratize information?

As we have seen, most of traditional news entities have the most presence on the Internet. Not only do they have the most traffic, but also most of the content on their website are from their traditional entities. And to this point, Matthew Hindman said that "accessibility does not equate visibility" and why news by this is that even though in theory everyone can be heard on the Internet, in practice, only people that are the most powerful are actually heard on the Internet. And so, he questions the myth of digital democracy. Does it even really exist?

The theory of media attendance says that when there is more supply than demand, people lapse into their own habits of news consumption. And even though habit has been studied as a gratification in U&G literature, we don't really study that in communication, which was my field. And so in *our* study, we will look at habits as an activity that has been routinely performed and is often performed early in people's lives. And to measure habits, we'll look at both primacy and frequency of news use.

So we hypothesize that contemporary Americans grow up in three distinct media environments. Adopting Palfrey and Grasser's *Digital Divide*, natives are people that grew up with the Internet, and when they are growing up, T.V. and radio are the most influential, or highly influential but declining and print is less central in their lives. Immigrants are those who grew up with T.V. and radio being the most dominant, and the print was still kind of important, and they adopt Internet later on in their lives. And the settlers are those who grew up with only print media, (that's analog only), and they don't really use the Internet. And we used the Pew data from 2008 that looked at media consumption and announced works on using logistic regression.

So the first two sets of hypotheses looks at habits in traditional media. The first sets of hypotheses looks at primacy, which is people's primary news medium, and the second set looks at people's most frequent news medium within traditional media. So, as you would imagine, we hypothesized that Settlers' primary and most frequent news medium would be print. For Immigrants, it will be TV and radio, and as for Natives, it will be the Internet. And as you would expect, all of the hypotheses are supported, except for TV, which makes the question, "What about TV is different?" So I have to mention here that even though we hypothesized that Immigrants will be the heaviest user of TV, we do find that Settlers actually watch more TV than Immigrants, and then would be the Natives. And so we did a post-hoc analysis looking at TV users by broadcast and cable, thinking that broadcast had been around much longer than cable, so you would imagine that cable users should decrease with age group and that broadcast should be in the increase. As we can see on the screen, we can see that interaction that we expected. To us, this is suggestive of habitual TV news usage even though in an earlier analysis we don't see that.

The third set of hypotheses is the most central to our study, where we're trying to say that now we have habits dictating our offline news consumption behaviors. These habits should actually mirror onto the Internet, because we have the same habits essentially. So, we would expect that Settlers would go to newspaper websites the most, Immigrants will go to TV and radio websites the most, and Natives will go to entrepreneurial sites such as Drudge and Slate. Lastly, we hypothesized that Natives will visit a greater variety of news sources, because they are natural inhabitants of the Internet, which is like the new medium that we are talking about.

The findings are as reported on this screen. As you can see, the newspaper and radio hypotheses are supported and TV is kind of half-supported. But then if we think back to earlier post-hoc analysis looking at broadcast and cable, it kind of makes sense, because 70% of the sources that we have reported in the data are CNN, MSNBC, and Fox, and they are all cable news websites. When it comes to untraditional news sources, we're just really at a loss of why this is happening. Even though the differences are not significant, we do wonder why Settlers seem to be using more untraditional sources. But then we went back to our data, and it appears that only 6% of all the Settlers actually go online, so they may actually be different from average Settlers even at the same age pool break. Also the fact that they were from a small sample size in this regard makes the finding more exploratory than conclusive.

Lastly, we tried to... Oh, I think I skipped one. I'm sorry. So, to better understand people's news consumption habits on the Internet, we broke the Immigrants into Young Immigrants versus Senior Immigrants. The interesting thing is that you can see the Natives and the Young Immigrants basically have identical news consumption habits when they're on the Internet. But when you look at the Senior Immigrants and Settlers, they're a

little bit more close. So you can see kind of a convergence of online news habits among a younger population. And now we go to the last hypothesis that's also supportive in that Natives do report using a greater variety of news sources than the other two cohorts. This is supported both by across type and logistic regression.

So the limitation of our study is that even though this is a news consumption survey, the sample sets that we have for online users are actually relatively small, and also the fact that this is an exploratory study makes our conclusion more suggestive than conclusive, as much as I don't like to say that. And there are possible alternative explanations that we do not account for in this paper that we'll hopefully explore in our future studies. Nonetheless, we do think that we do have interesting patterns that are suggested in this paper and that habits do seem to play a role in offline and online news consumption.

The implications of this study is suggestive that habits dictate people's offline news consumption habits, which is what you would expect, and also that habits actually also influence your online news consumption behaviors. And the third point goes back to Matthew Hindman's claim that accessibility does not equate visibility. We would like to argue in our paper that even if you have accessibility *and* visibility, if people don't have the habits of going to alternative sources, then the concept of digital democracy is really only merited in theory but not in practice. Also, there seems to be maturation of habitual news consumption use over time, and as we see on the previous slide, younger populations seem to be converging in their online news usage.

So now we think about the future of journalism. Adam says in 1993, "We can only change what we understand," which means that we should understand why and how people are consuming the news across different media. But as of right now, I am not certain that we'll have a clear picture for either question. And in my dissertation, I will be looking at news consumption using a U&G and IM model, and hopefully in two years, I will be able to come back with a better answer of why and how people come to the news, and I can report back to you guys. And this is my presentation. Thank you.

[Applause.]

**Iris Chyi:** Our next presenter is Seth Lewis from here. Seth actually helped me establish our Media Economics Research Group. Seth is soon to become the Assistant Professor at the University of Minnesota. He came up with two brilliant ideas: the participatory logic versus the professional logic shaping the innovation of online news. So let's hear from Seth.

**Seth Lewis:** OK. Well, I need to say at the start that it's a little bit intimidating because in the course of academic research, it's a rare thing to be able to present some of your work to an audience that includes people who were directly involved in that work, in terms of being sources, people

that I've interviewed and so forth. Some of those people are here today, so I get that opportunity. And if I am off base, I suppose that I'm going to hear about it in Q&A portion of this.

As the title suggests, this is a study of the Knight News Challenge, which needs very little introduction to an audience such as this. It has very quickly in the past few years become *the* prominent competition, innovation competition, in the future of news space. And so, the News Challenge and the Knight Foundation more generally are the focus of my dissertation research. In essence, to look at what kind of influence they're having in shaping the nature of innovation, which is such a hot topic right now in journalism.

The overarching question here that I bring to this, and one that I've been kicking around for the last little while, is this idea of professional control versus open participation, which is sort of a fundamental tension that we see in a lot of studies and research about the sociology of journalism today. It's really not — you could say it's not unique to journalism. Virtually all professions seek to safeguard some body of knowledge of shared practices and norms and so forth. It is particularly those that work in information have been severely challenged in the digital age by the degree to which the digitization enables infinite copy-ability. So you have this tension going on right now in terms of professions seeking to figure out where they stand and how and to what degree they control the information that is part and parcel to their profession and how they interact with a public that can engage to such a greater degree.

So, in trying to conceptualize this—this isn't anything necessarily new—[laughs]—but I tried to coin these terms of “professional logic” and “participatory logic.” And there's other work on media logic. There's work by Mark Deuze on editorial logic and market logic in journalism. The basic idea here is to try to at least say that with this tension, that professions, again, not just journalism, but in general, seek to retain some level of control, some sense of gatekeeping control, and they do it for normative purposes of trying to serve society, trying to preserve ethics and standards, and so forth. And that that bumps up against this natural tension—the tendency, I should say—that is both enabled and encouraged by digitization of a greater end-user participation, a greater distributed control.

So in looking at this tension, my basic question was, how do news innovators, in their perceptions and in their practices, how do they wrestle with this question? We have a lot of research now that suggests that in newsrooms and in sort of traditional media, that yes, they are opening lots of—quite a few spaces for participation, but by and large, journalists sort of prefer to let the audience have their own little party in the comments section. “Thank you. We'll kind of leave you over there. We'll do our own thing.” So this idea of actually bringing participation and more openness into the news

process—its creation, its filtering, and its distributing—is still somewhat of a foreign idea in most of traditional mainstream media.

Now I think this question gets a little more interesting when we start to look at this in the context of a subsidy model. So if we think of the professional logic, participatory logic as being forms of news *assembly*, news *subsidy* then kind of brings a new idea to this. It makes it a little more interesting. Basically, this is a pretty crude model, I'll admit. But you know, quadrant one sort of illustrates how journalism has mostly been done in Western countries for much of the past century. It was done in a gatekeeping, sort of professional orientation of control, with a for-profit mode of subsidy. And as we've seen just here in the panels today and of course in the past especially five years, there's been a popping up of all sorts of things in the other quadrants. I'm particularly interested in quadrant four, precisely because it's opposite of what we're most used to. So what's going on over there? What happens when news is both done in a more participatory fashion and subsidized in a more non-profit alternative way?

This led me to have some interest in the News Challenge, because by nature of the rules and the contest, but also by nature of simply the winners who have come out of that over the past few years, there is a more participatory element to that. And obviously, they're funded in a non-profit way. So how do they manage this tension? How do they make sense of it, and to what extent is this an issue for them?

I spoke with about a dozen News Challenge winners, most of them—well, I should say, they were different in terms of their geographic location, the years in which they won, they were spread among the different years, so some of them had finished their project, some were just beginning, but they were all similar in the sense that I looked for ones who were attempting to start some kind of a news organization or platform, a body through which news would get put together in some fashion.

So in analyzing the transcripts from these interviews, kind of the big finding that I found [is] that by and large these news innovators... And I will point out here they're not the only news innovators. I'm just using that as a label. You don't have to just win the News Challenge to be an innovator. These news innovators had rendered unproblematic this tension of, for instance, professional logic and participatory logic, precisely because for *them* the notion of journalism as profession was much — it was less salient. They were more focused on journalism as practice. In other words, they saw journalism as an open-source practice to be shared as opposed to a proprietary profession to be protected. And in doing so then, it just sort of blows up the tension. Right? If you don't feel that journalism as a profession needs to be protected in some fashion through control, you have no problem, basically, with opening the gates and letting other people in and looking at it in a much more open way.

And this sort of way in which they made this unproblematic, I found in three interesting ways: A practice open in *tools*. Three kind of key things I want to poke on for a second. The notion of practice here is that journalism as practice implies that the whole process—the creating, the filtering, the sharing of news information—it should be an activity in which many take part without—and this is key—without the ideological baggage of occupational control, of demarcating who’s in and who’s out, who’s a journalist and who’s not. As one grantee put it... Oh, and I’ll mention, too, another thing that is interesting about practice is, not only is it a practice that can be shared, anyone can take part in, but also there’s this normative idea that journalism, you just get better at it with practice. It’s just, you know, professional journalists and citizen journalists, the key distinction is one of frequency, of degree of doing the work. So professionals, they do it more often, so they’re better at it. One grantee put it this way: “We are, I think, a little too ready to use this phrase ‘Being a journalist’ as if journalism is a state of *being*. We should try to get into the habit of talking about *doing* journalism. Journalism is an activity.”

Now when journalism is seen as practice, the next logical step, articulated by virtually all of these news innovators I spoke with, becomes a word of distribution, of actually doing it. So how do you make this happen? In effect, if we conceptualize journalism as a shared practice rather than as an exclusive profession, then why not open it up? Why not share it with everyone? And how do we do that?

One little story that I think illustrates this well. One of the more interesting things I found was in speaking with Richard Anderson of *Village Soup* in Maine. You may be familiar with the project there. And *Village Soup* received its grant to... Let me just back up. The basic idea of *Village Soup* is that they have a website where businesses and citizens can pay for certain access to publish on the site. What’s truly unique about this is that they, the outsiders, use the very same CMS, the same online platform, as the professional journalists themselves. So that’s pretty different. Knight gave them some money to create an open-source version of this and to be able to share that in other communities. Initially, Richard Anderson was a little skeptical, because he was worried about the open source part. He was a little worried about competition and how others could invade his territory. And then he told me that he realized that he had little to fear, because mainstream news organizations had invested too much pride and too much capital in their legacy [and] proprietary systems. And also, there’s a professional cultural element to this. This is how he put it. He said, “With a system like *Village Soup’s*, you get open access to businesses and to citizen journalists and to be able to share content from one site to the other site. These are all things that large newspapers, legacy systems were never designed to do.” In essence, a logic of professional control precludes news organizations from imagining, from the get-go, that publishing systems could be such that other people, the outsiders, could actually publish coexistent on the same platform

with the journalists, so that they could have this sort of equal access to the tools of publication. That is a radical shift in mindset.

Finally, here with tools, what's striking about the News Challenge when you start to look at it is how many of these projects are focused on building some kind of tool that enables journalism, and more significantly, tools that enable ordinary people to do journalism. And we've heard some of that from David Cohn today. And he pointed out to me when I was talking to him that it would have been silly—and I'm paraphrasing here—but he said it would have been silly a few years ago to create tools to help other kinds of people to do journalism, but now it seems totally natural.

OK. So... [Microphone quits working.] OK. I'll just talk loud. OK. All right. So by rendering unproblematic this whole tension issue of participatory and professional, news innovators in essence tend to rhetorically pull apart journalism and sort of open it up and say, let's preserve this. [Microphone is fixed.] Can you hear me now? OK. So the basic idea—I'll sort of bounce back to the slides—but they can pull apart journalism to say, look, let's keep this and let's get rid of that. Let's keep these principles, the ethics that are codified in SPJ's Code of Ethics, the basic ideas of fairness, accuracy, and so forth, but we don't need to be worried about scoops anymore. We don't need to be worried about sort of binary objectivity. Those were old practices, bad habits that we can let go of. And in a sense, because they have approached this whole idea from a different vantage point, outside of the occupational ideology of control, they can now see how they can pull apart journalism and do different things with it.

OK. So, one of the grantees put it this way, and I like this. He said, "In essence, they're trying to ferry the values." It implies sort of this migration, you know, the aster of taking the values from a old world of journalism and bringing the ones that are truly worth saving to a new place where they can be replanted and re-grown. But I think also implicit in this is the idea that by leaving certain things behind, you create new space to plant new kinds of seeds, new kinds of values. And one of those key values... Go to the next slide. The interesting thing here, too, is that they're creating a new space for a new ethic of participation. Now, again, we've heard a lot about participatory journalism today. What I would suggest is interesting about this is that it's not that participatory journalism *can* be done, but rather that it *should* be done, and that it should be part and parcel of the news process.

OK. I'll go ahead and put the rest up. And I saw this in the way they talked about participation. This is interesting to see how it came in talking about this faith in the public, this confidence in the community, in the collective. And sort of in this, you find this sense that we're moving away from a focus on the individual expertise of a trained professional in whom we should entrust our faith and control, and rather to focus on the value and wisdom and intelligence that can be gained by tapping into the community. That rather than focusing on gatekeeping and being worried about sort of

controlling what gets out and what goes where, that instead the focus should be on community management. That phrase “community management” came up a number of times as grantees talked about the need to help curate the best of what’s out there. We’ve heard these kinds of ideas, but it signals a shift from individual to collective that I think is really quite interesting. Finally, there’s this kind of shift from talking about content, “Hey, we’re journalists. We produce content,” to one of, “We’re journalists. We connect. We connect people.” We heard earlier from Matt Thompson about relationships. Content to relationships. That’s the shift you see here that’s going on.

Finally, I just wanted to touch on a couple of things. This may be a little—threat sounds a little strong, but basically the idea is that the question... I’ve focused mostly on perception issues up to now. When it comes to practices, what’s going on? One of the interesting things was that a number of these grantees sensed some real sort of concern about how they’re going to keep things going into the future. The biggest issue is one of just simply attention. In a fragmented media world, attention truly is the scarce thing that we’re all trying to latch onto. And this is a real concern for a lot of the grantees is, how do they develop sufficient traffic, attention, and so forth?

Part of this, too... I’m just hoping to touch on that last one. Another thing that they expressed was some frustration with the Knight Foundation in terms of getting the support they felt like they needed internally to be able to—this is critical—go from ideas to institutions. In other words, as one grantee put it, you know, the Knight Foundation used to fund institutions that had ideas. Now it funds ideas by sometimes just individuals. It funds that seemingly one-off projects. The challenge is taking those from one-off projects to sustainable institutions, to actually institutionalize them. That seems to be one of the critical challenges for innovation in journalism going forward is this idea of, how do we take these growing things and actually give them deep roots and institutionalize them in some fashion? So that’s it for the slides.

[Applause.]

**Rosental Calmon Alves:** So next, can we talk from there and we move the slides for you? What about that? It’s a deal? OK.

**Iris Chyi:** OK. Our next presenter is Juliette de Maeyer from the University of Brussels. She is going to talk about visualizing or mapping hyperlink networks.

**Juliette de Maeyer:** The main idea in my research is that the web actually lacks geography. On the web, we surf, we navigate, we ride to information super-highways. It lacks a sort of global idea of where websites are situated within a larger space. So to grasp a global overview and to find our way, the web needs to be mapped. That would be the next slide. As the web

possesses no inherent spatial properties, there is a need for spatialization; that is, the use of graphical techniques and visual metaphors in order to map data. In this respect, there is no single true representation of a so-called reality similar to what you have when you map the earth. There are different maps with different communicated goals, depending on what the mapmaker wants to show. (Uh, no. Not yet.) [laughs] For example, this map, it shows a subjective depiction of online communities, but it might seem slightly old-fashioned. You know, Twitter is not in it. But it communicates something—something according to what the mapmaker wanted to show. I guess something related with humor here.

I specifically chose to focus on hyperlink maps, so this is the next slide, [laughs], representing web sites and the links between them. Hyperlink maps are interesting because when you put together sites and links, they form networks, and networks, they have remarkable properties. But it's also interesting because hyperlinks matter for online journalism. The links embody some of the premises associated with online journalism; namely, things such as interactivity, transparency, or diversity. With links, the media prophets said the audience could [have] access to more context, to sources of stories, to a variety of opinions, and therefore, journalism would be improved. So links matter for online journalism.

So, what's the idea behind hyperlink maps? Well, I'm going to show examples of existing maps. This one—no, this one. It's not some weird satellite picture of an ash cloud or something. It's the French blogosphere. It's called Wikiopole. It shows the highest ranked blogs, French blogs, according to the Wikio ranking, which is similar to Technorati, but for France in this case. In this map, every node is a blog, and we can see the links between them. I don't know if you can see clearly, but there are links. The color of the nodes, they represent the thematic category to which the blogs belong. White is for literature, green for politics, and so on. What's very important here is that the position of the blogs on the maps only depends on the links. That is, linked nodes are attracted and non-linked nodes are pushed about. This means—and this is very important—that no one decided that all of the blogs about literature (the white ones) should be close, but they are close because they are interconnected because there are links between them.

So, the map is able to show us interesting phenomena. This map is updated every month. And it allows us to see the evolution of the French blogosphere. For example, (and that is the next one), since 2009, a particular category of blogs has emerged and it has now become an entire continent. It's pictured in red things over there. Those are blogs devoted to arts and crafts or to knitting. There's even an entire archipelago of blogs devoted to scrapbooking on the upper side of the map. This is surprising in a blogosphere, which was traditionally dominated by high-tech blogs. High-tech blogs are the small part there. High-tech blogs which were the early adopters and which were actually completely outnumbered by the latecomers that are knitting,

scrapbooking, and arts and crafts blogs. So such phenomena would not have been so fully visible if the map didn't exist, so that's why the map is interesting.

It can show us global phenomena at the scale of a blogosphere, but it can also lead us to highlight individual characteristics of, for instance, still on the same map, let's focus on a particular blog. This blog here is called *Le Coulisses de Bruxelles*. It's written by a French journalist named Jean Quatremer, and it's a blog about the European Union and European affairs. When you look at the links between this blog and other blogs in the same map, you can see that on the one hand there is a respectable amount of incoming links. Those are the red links. Those are links stemming from other blogs to Jean Quatremer's blog. And on the other hand, you can find only four outgoing links—those are the yellow links. [Technical difficulties.] OK. So, can you hear me.

**Audience:** Yes.

**Juliette de Maeyer:** Yes. Only four outgoing links that the blogger creates towards other blogs. So this leads to the following observation: Jean Quatremer's blog *is* in the blogosphere because his blog is linked to, but he does not really actively take part in it. He does not create links or not that much—only four of them. It becomes even more interesting when you look at the same blog in another map. This is a map of the European Web. It pictures more than 2,000 sites about European affairs—sites of public institutions, media, associations and so on. So Jean Quatremer's blog is also in it, because it's about European affairs, but the linking pattern is clearly different. You have incoming links in red, but also a fair amount of outgoing links. The yellow one and the green one are reciprocal links. When you put those two maps side by side, it questions the identity of the journalist blogger. Is he more a blogger integrated in a community of bloggers and taking part in the conversation which is embodied in the links, or is he more a journalist relying on diversity of sources, such as institutions of the media and so on and linking to those sources?

Those quickly described examples I hope have convinced you that studying hyperlinks is an interesting perspective, but I'm convinced of it anyway, so I've applied it to my topic of interest, which is online news. And for my first mapping attempt, a Belgian news site. So the main research question I had in mind was a very simple one. It is the following: What do Belgian news sites link to?

So here is the general map of Belgian news sites and their links. So in red and with the URLs displayed, you can see the 13 news sites I have explored and of which I have extracted links. It's important to underline that those sites were not picked in advance on a list of all the Belgian news sites, but they were discovered along the exploration. I actually started with the top ranked Belgian news site, extracted the links from it, and within those links I

discovered other news sites, and then I extracted links from them, and so on. By applying this snowball sample scheme, I explored almost all Belgian nationwide generalist news sites. And Belgium is, of course, a small market for news.

The result of this exploration is the global map here. We can see that a part of the links [are] shared by the news sites. Those are the green nodes at the center, which are at the center because they are linked by and therefore attracted by different news sites around them, so different red nodes around them. Another part of the links is specific to each source site. Those are the group of links on the edges of the map, isolated islands only related to one site.

So besides this global overview, I have classified all the sites linked according to different categories, and I want to show you two zooms on sub-graphs. This one is a zoom of all the links to media sites. This means links to other news media, to Belgian news media or international news media. I have displayed a few URLs so that you can have an idea. There are also links to what I call media-related sites. Those are, for example, the journalists unions or media regulation organizations and so on.

So in my opinion, this map tells us two things. First, contrary to the largely held belief, news sites do not fear linking to other news sites because they are afraid of losing their audience or something like that. On the contrary, an important part of the links—and this is about one-fifth of the whole network—an important part of the links directs the users towards other news sites and not exclusively to news sites owned by the same corporation, [but to] a variety of other news sites. Secondly, it tells us that the media are linking to other media, that media are self-centered, which is consistent with the idea of news workers, of journalists as a professional community which fosters links to members of that community.

Another interesting sub-graph is this one. On this one, I tried to put together all the links to sites that in a way or another do not really provide additional journalistic content. And I know that the idea of journalistic content can be discussed for hours, but nevertheless there is something here. Their sites are link to services such as weather forecasts, train schedules, phone directories, links to sites related to leisure, such as travel agencies and amusement parks, links to brand sites, and so on. The question here is, are those links providing more compact other links leading to sources, other links leading to a diversity of opinion? It's at least questionable. Those links that don't fit with the promises of what links could add to online journalism, they rather seem to have a different function, something to do with the role of news media's community managers. Something like that. I don't know. Put together, those links represent something like a quarter of all the networks, so it's an important phenomenon.

Where are the links providing more content then? Here, I just wanted to show you this last map that I won't comment [on] that much, but it's just for the beauty of it, because I like it. I find it beautiful. [Laughter.] Those are the blogs hosted by one of the news sites I have explored. So those are the blogs hosted by that site and all the links stemming from the blogs. When I saw that map, the complexity of it—and it's only the blogs hosted by *one* of the news sites, I don't even imagine what a map grouping all the blogs would look like—when I saw that, I thought, wow, this is a remarkable window on the web. An entire universe of connections that is only—and this is very important—it's only a few clicks away from a news site's home page. So maybe hosting blogs is a convenient way for news sites to get integrated in the web community through the links, or maybe it's a way to outsource the linking, all of the linking functions, because most of the links are actually content links. This is one of the many questions hyperlink maps can raise; a question that needs to be explored and fully discussed with you and me.

[Applause.]

**Iris Chyi:** We have another study also touching upon the visual aspect of online journalism by Nuno Vargas from the University of Barcelona. His study is talking about *From the Pixel to the Grid and Back*, the design principle.

**Nuno Vargas:** Hi, everybody. Thanks for still being around. A couple of disclaimers before we start the show. I've said this before. My name, Nuno Vargas, University of Barcelona. I'm a PhD student on selected days of the week. I'm also an art director on a newsroom in Lisbon, Portugal, which basically I'm torn between enjoying the world and saving the world every day, so it sometimes gets a bit complicated to go by. The last thing is this paper comes from my PhD thesis and it's a very long and kind of exhaustive dissertation, so what I tried to do in this presentation is extract some examples. And what I'll mainly be talking about will be online narratives and the use of online narratives in newspapers, if they're present, if they're visible and how they're working.

[These are] a few things [about] how the newspapers they've analyzed in Portugal, Spain, Argentina, and Brazil are studying right now. Basically, we're taking advantage of the full potential of the medium. What I've noticed is most newsrooms haven't actually embraced the medium as a whole different thing—the Internet as a whole different thing. I think everybody has talked about this on the corridors and at every conference or every newsroom we go [to]. We're still stuck a bit on the paper metaphor. We don't really know which format to give to our content, which kind of different format we can give to our content, and we're not pushing the stories or the news or whatever you want to call it to a new level, which I think the user is already asking for. Because a lot of younger or not so young generations are going to blogs or to other websites, because the common newspaper websites are not giving what they want.

So this is one of the status we have. They're still a paper-based concept. Sorry for my dodgy English here. We're not actually getting the best out of our news feeds. Basically, [what] we have to think here is that online newspapers function as filters through an incredible amount of meta-data off information we have. It's not only the amount [of information], it's the kind of information we have. We have photos, videos. We have people that are shooting things on their mobile phone, and in two minutes, they're posting it on YouTube or some other site. We have journalists that are in Haiti or some other place, and they just call us and said, "Oh, I've just [shot] this, and this happened, and this..." And we need to find formats, and we need to find ways of showing these things to people, because it's a matter of quantity and also a matter of diversity.

Think about this: the web is a dynamical medium and it has to be embraced as one, as *it*, to fulfill its full potential. And it's one of the things that John-Henry was talking [about] yesterday. He said, "There's formats and there's platforms, but it's all about the news and getting people to understand the news." And one of the things that I found interesting in his work is that he brought up the model, for instance, *The Guardian* printed and online. And *The Guardian* uses a specific typeface. When he did the iPhone application, he changed that typeface, which is called *The Guardian* to Georgian. You only know that if you're actually looking at it and seeing how it works. So that's the kind of moves of things we should be doing and should be thinking about.

A few, I won't be so pretentious to say, solutions, but a few things that we should be thinking about [are] these online narratives, which are compact modules of images, sound, text. And I can't hear the online journalists. I was a bit hesitant about this, but it should be just the journalists has the possibility to reach a vast audience and to go through it in a really complete and exhaustive manner and just to go... I mean, it doesn't mean the people are going to read it all, going to see it all, going to see all the movies or all the infographics that newspapers want to show, but that should be available to them for a better and more complete experience and information. So online narratives set an experience standard, which I'll just say allows for prediction, planning, and explanation.

Everybody says the web is really fast, which is true, but it's also always present. So if you don't understand something, you can go back, and you can try to see it again. You can find new ways to understand how things happen. It's like one thing is [when] Michael Jackson passed away. Another thing is what happened, as one of the things is, which kind of medicine, which kind of heart phenomenon made him pass away? So there's levels of information that could be explored more in terms of online newspapers and more, which I don't see really. I noticed in all the cases that I analyzed that newsrooms haven't grasped really, [of] the ones I have analyzed, the concept of taking advantage of multimedia, and they don't show their so-called multimedia products. And there's a very simple exercise that I'm about to show, which is

a mapping [of] what's happening in the web pages and the home pages of those newspapers. So if our role is to make data visible to the user in the best way possible and allowing them to make their own decisions, we still have a bit work to do.

Aron Pilhofer, which Cindy Royal quoted a lot yesterday on her paper, is the head of the Interactive News Technology Department of *The New York Times*, and he's a really very bright and intelligent fellow, which I have the privilege to know. He once told me something like unedited data—if I'm pronouncing this well—is like a mess of things that you can't really see. It doesn't matter how much data you have if you can't really edit it in a way for people to see and to consult it anytime they want. And when I say *edit*, it's not like, oh, I'm going to hide this and just show this. It's put it available for people to make their own conclusions. So I'm still on the negative tone. Sorry. These are the main problems and even sometimes incomplete usage of integration and multimedia resources. This is, I have to say, is all from the newspapers I've analyzed, as I said, Brazil, Argentina, Portugal, and Spain. There's no information architecture in any of the newspapers. There's a few basic structures that were inherited from the newspaper, from the paper itself, the physical paper, but there's nothing that's native to the medium. Ambiguous and unbalanced relations between the use of advertising and its placement on the page.

One of the cases I've analyzed is one really new newspaper in Portugal that should be like a fresh — have a fresh approach to things, especially because the paper version was really fresh and different. But when they went to the online version, which is interesting, I have to say, they decided to do all their structure and all their design based on the advertising. This is sort of weird, probably bad karma, because they had the fewest advertisers ever in the history of Portuguese online newspapers. They had like two clients that weren't paying all that much then, but they were basing all their structure and design in advertising, and that didn't work all that well for them, so we should... I think the advertising is important; although, people said this morning it only accounts for roughly 5 to 7% of the income. But, I mean, make it bolder, bigger, but just make it, you know, this is the advertising, let's go to the news. Don't try to trick people into things and especially don't determine your structure based on the advertising.

And again and again, people really don't want to leave the paper metaphor. One of the things I criticize, for instance, on *New York Times* approach to what they say is going to be their iPad application is that there is still—I don't know, it's my opinion, a lot of people's opinion—is that they still think it's my grandfather that reads the newspaper is going to grab the iPad and read the newspaper like he's reading it. I think the iPad, it's more related to the online interface than to the paper interface. The Times Reader, although being a very interesting project, was never a very successful one and probably for a reason. I'm not saying that people wouldn't pay for a really good product. It's just that's not the way of the natural path for things to go. I mean, the iPad

is a fantastic—well, a few people have it around—the iPad is just too good to be true. Everything, the design, everything is slick, perfect. It's the best screen ever, and it's good to have it on your lap, it's good to travel around, but it's not something that you treat as a newspaper or probably even a book. But, I mean, a newspaper is kind of different, because you scan, you don't read. So probably we should go get over that idea of trying to ever always emulate the paper version and all that metaphor.

So, this is one of the examples I was talking about. I use these pretty obvious and simple color codes. Red is photography, blue is multimedia, and grey is going to be advertising. When I say *multimedia*, I see graphics, video, or even just buttons that you can use as multimedia elements. This is a very simple and basic mapping, but it helped me understand that, for starters, a lot of the newspapers really don't have a structure, don't have a grid, so to say, that they can call stable or even usable. So you don't see a lot of multimedia connections there.

And this is another newspaper, and you see even less multimedia there. What's very similar is that you can see the advertising is the only thing that's similar—the grey patch there. For instance, this blue rectangle here, I consider it multimedia because it has an arrow to go forward and backward, but basically it's just a slideshow embedded on the homepage. This is one really well-known newspaper and probably the best, most known newspaper in Spain, *El País*. And although it was one of the pioneers in multimedia, this is the status of their normal website right now. So there's no videos, no nothing on their home page. There's even no mention to any of this on the web page.

And Rosenthal is going to get onto me, because I'm always bashing Brazilian newspapers. I'm treating them bad. But this is an institution in Brazil, this Folha de Sao Paulo. I know their online designer is a really talented designer. He's a really nice person, but what is happening here on this web page, it's hell went loose once. I mean, they never closed the door and everything is just coming and going all the way. So although, as you see here, they have a lot of multimedia references. Like on the corner, on the bottom, they have a video, which I don't know if that's the best place for the video to be, but as you can see, they have a lot of advertising, and their structure is a bit of a maze. I mean, being this a mystery, as somebody told [me] when asked about the Drudge Report, the whole thing about designing, although it's not exact science, it's pretty obvious there's some navigation and some user interface things that I also talk about in my thesis and I talked about here last year, but I think people should get a bit of a grasp of what they should be doing and not just throw things online. I mean, the web is endless, but people's capacity to read on the web and our patience is not endless, so let's just try to get things done properly.

So in conclusion, it's a new medium. Let's take advantage of it, use its potential and design for it. In other words, don't take your bathing suit to the

North Pole, because it's still clothing, but it won't fit, you know, it wouldn't be the appropriate one to have there. Again, it's been a privilege to be here. Thanks for listening to me.

[Applause.]

**Iris Chyi:** Our last paper asks a huge question: *Is the Internet Europeanizing or Americanizing global journalism?* Matthew Powers and his colleagues.

**Matthew Powers:** So, it is a very big question and one that we can't resolve obviously, but let me try and explain what that question means. This is a cross-national comparative analysis of print and online newspapers in the United States, France, and Denmark. And previous cross-national research has shown that the form and content of news continues to vary significantly across national boundaries. And in their important overview of things like this, Dan Hallin and Paolo Mancini argue for the persistence of what they identify as three distinct different types of media systems that have evolved within Europe and North America that result from markedly different relationships between journalism, politics, and other elements of society. And so in the first, you have the liberal model, which is characterized by informational model objectivity [with] higher amounts of advertising traditionally. And then you also have, to the other side, the polarized pluralist model, which France is often talked about as the sort of leader there. And then you have what's sort of thought of as a hybrid form, and that's the democratic corporatist model, which sort of incorporates elements of both. As a result of the differing relations, the content and form of news and opinion in these systems also tend to differ. So this includes things like the aspects, the relationship between news and opinion, the mixing of journalistic and non-journalistic authors, and the formats through which ideas and information are presented, so news analyses, interviews, things like that.

This study asks a more simple question than the title of the paper actually implies. It says, "To what extent and in what ways are existing cross-national differences in print newspapers being maintained or transformed online?" And drawing on a variety of literatures, it seems to us that there would be three broad possible answers. The first is that there's no real difference, and this isn't exactly a null hypothesis. This would be the sort of new institutionalist or field theory, Pierre Porch's argument, which is that typically, there are so many actual relationships—social, economic, political—that actually go into a media system, that simply changing the technology will not actually change the sort of fundamental aspects. So here, we should actually expect for print and online newspapers to be largely comparable.

And then there's two other broad schools of thought. One that says maybe it will move in an Americanizing direction. And what do we mean by that? We basically just mean maybe it will become less opinion-oriented, more informational, more news, and also more advertising, more commercialized. And on the other hand, maybe it will work in a sort of Europeanizing

direction. Maybe there will be more opinion elements and maybe more deliberative elements.

A quick note on the method. So we sampled three leading elite newspapers from each country—the U.S., France, and Denmark—on three separate dates over three months, and this happened in 2008. Both print, front pages, and online home pages were coded for all elements, and so this includes things like *genre*, so opinion, advertising, news, multimedia, etc.; *topical focus*, so international news, government news, sports news, leisure, etc.; and *authorship*, so is it written by a journalist, a wire service agency, a non-journalistic expert, so is there an academic who's writing an opinion piece, and non-affiliated individuals, so comment sections typically. And what I'd like to do is just to run through quickly four of the findings—there's more than that—and then just sort of offer some commentary on it.

So, what are the findings? Advertising is generally found to be more prevalent and prominent online than in print for newspapers in all three countries. And cross-national differences are less online than in print. Now, part of this is, of course, you know, we only did print front pages and, of course, in the U.S., advertising is not typically on the front pages. So part of it is research design. But in terms of prominence, in terms of where advertisements are actually placed, 58.4% of all ads were prominently placed in the U.S., 69.8 in Demark, and 57.9 in France. So there's this sort of general trend as you move towards online for advertising.

The second considers news and opinion. Here, I think we find something interesting. And that's that the prevalence of opinion genres—so things like official editorials, signed commentaries, opinion-oriented blogs—increases from print to online for U.S. newspapers, stays more or less the same for French newspapers, and decreases for Danish news outlets. Notably, the increase in opinion is most substantial for U.S. online newspapers, thus reversing France's relatively greater emphasis on opinion in print. The prominence of opinion, likewise, increases from print to online for both U.S. and French papers. Again, the U.S. increase is such that its emphasis on opinion exceeds that of French newspapers. On the other hand, opinion virtually disappears online for Danish papers, where signed commentaries and official editorials make up just over 7% of Danish Page 1 print editions, these disappear online and are not supplanted by blogs. So conversely, the prevalence of news decreases from print to online for U.S. and French papers, while holding steady or increasing for Danish newspapers. In sum there, while French and U.S. news outlets seem to be at least moving in the same direction though at different degrees in the shift from print to online, Danish newspapers seem to be moving in the exact opposite direction.

The third finding is considering non-journalistic voices. Non-journalistic voices, especially non-affiliated individuals—for the most part, readers speaking in forums or chats—are more prevalent, obviously, online than in print in both France and the U.S., while there is no change in Denmark. Non-

journalistic voices are more likely to appear in French newspapers than in their U.S. and Danish counterparts, a gap that increases overall in the shift from print to online. But to put these findings in context, it's important to emphasize that journalists are overwhelmingly the most dominant authors in all three countries.

The last is topical focus. International and government news for the most part are less prevalent online than in print versions in all three countries, while the prevalence as well as prominence of light news and crime and disaster news is for the most part higher online than in print versions. So let me just offer a few thoughts or commentaries on it.

So the findings, I think, are surprising in several ways. Comparing online versus print editions in each of these countries, there are a number of areas of convergence, at least in the direction of change. So, prominence of advertising is higher online than in print newspapers for all three countries, thus indicating perhaps a shift to a more commercialized model of journalism. But at the same time, moving from print to online, there is a decrease in the proportion of the news, (though not in Denmark), a steady amount of slight rise in the amount of deliberative content, so things like interviews, transcripts, chats, in all three countries, and an increase in the amount and prominence of opinion in the U.S. and perhaps in France, though again not in Denmark. Despite the potentially global reach of online papers, international news is less prevalent, in this sample, online than in print. And news in general tends to be lighter, so more sports, more weather, more leisure, than is in print, and slightly more sensationalistic, so more crime and disaster news in France and perhaps in Denmark, though it doesn't appear to be the case in the U.S. Finally, non-journalistic authored content is higher online than in print in France and the U.S., but again the journalists are, of course, the dominant authorial voices.

So in general, these findings paint a picture of online news across media systems simultaneously becoming more commercialized and more localized and lighter in its orientation towards news, while at the same time opening up, if only slightly, towards a more deliberative, opinion-oriented, and non-journalist controlled approach. There is evidence in a very broad sense that we're witnessing both a Europeanizing and an Americanizing effect.

Another surprise is that while French print newspapers are more likely to include opinion articles on their front pages than their U.S. counterparts, online, one finds exactly the opposite pattern. So in other words, online, it's the U.S. newspapers that tend to put opinion more prevalent and more prominent than the French papers. However, unlike the Danish press, French newspapers are clearly moving in the same—or appear to be moving in the same direction in placing a greater emphasis on opinion. So at the same time as this happens, French online papers are more likely than U.S. papers to feature deliberative formats and more likely to make room for non-journalistic authors. So the point there is that how online technology is

deployed depends crucially on existing social, political, and cultural factors linked to distinct media systems.

Our findings concerning the Danish case may be the most surprising. Whereas French and U.S. newspapers have more opinion and less news online than in print, Danish papers have less opinion and the same amount or more news online as in print. So in general, our findings do not support the hypothesis that Danish newspapers, either in print or online, are actually a hybrid of the U.S. and French models. Rather, the emphasis on news and information seems to be stronger in Denmark than in either France or the U.S., and so more research is required to understand this sort of Danish particularity and to give it a larger theoretical form within the existing literature.

At the same time, differences shouldn't be overstated. So news continues to be dominant in online newspapers in all three countries. Likewise, opinion and deliberation are less prevalent in the first few screens of the Danish newspapers. A thorough analysis of their website might actually demonstrate that it's there and it's just not put on the front page. Contingent business strategies may be at work, too. There were announcements in the fall by two of the newspapers sampled from Denmark that they were going to make their print versions harder, so harder news, political news, analysis, commentary, and their online versions softer with more light news and entertainment.

Just in concluding, as always, the study always has limitations. And I'll just sort of note a few. Incorporating more parts of the day into the research framework would, of course, strengthen the data that we've presented here. The data was collected at eight a.m., all times local. Additional collections at afternoon and evening points would sort of flush out the ways in which the form of news changes over the day. Additionally, while we think our project captured important data from the front pages of both print and online editions, here again, a larger sample would be very useful, although extraordinarily time-consuming. And lastly, the form of online news continues to change. So this was done in 2008, and several of the sites that we looked at have actually been redesigned, so we simply hope that our findings will serve as sort of a historical snapshot of print and online newspapers in three different media systems and as sort of a template and encouragement for continued empirical research. Thanks.

[Applause.]

**Iris Chyi:** A few questions before the coffee break.

**Man:** Thanks for your presentations. This one is for Mademoiselle Maeyer. Thanks. That was the most beautiful presentation of the entire symposium.

**Juliette de Maeyer:** That's why I like presenting it, you know, because writing about it is so frustrating, because you cannot put big images and so on, so I liked showing...

**Man:** Well, I think you should sell t-shirts next year with your—[laughter]—blogosphere t-shirts. Terrific. I just wanted you to speak a little—I don't have a question in particular—I wanted you to speak a little more about you said that hosting blogs, blog hosting on larger news websites could be a way of driving traffic, and I wanted you to just speak a little more about that, what your thoughts are, what your findings are.

**Juliette de Maeyer:** The idea is not really driving traffic. It's, well...

**Man:** [Inaudible.]

**Juliette de Maeyer:** Blog hosting. Those are the blogs. Now you can have blogs on blog platforms such as Blogger or something like that. All newspapers also host blogs, so they, on the one hand, the blogs are written by the journalists, but also blogs are written by anyone. That is a blog hosted by the website itself. Is that maybe clearer this way? OK. So...

**Man:** [Inaudible.]

**Juliette de Maeyer:** OK.

**Man:** [Inaudible.]

**Scott Thomas:** Cool. My name is Scott Thomas. I'm here at Texas State University. My question is for the gentleman presenting the micropayment model. You started off your presentation by saying that news organizations cannot generate enough revenue to sustain themselves through online advertising only and they needed a combination of micropayments, subscriptions, and online advertising. I was wondering how you take into account all the companies that do make lots of money online strictly through advertising, and what is it about the news business that makes them immune to making this kind of money through online advertisements.

**Geoffrey Graybeal:** Sure. Jay can add to this as well. Actually, I saw on the Twitter-sphere, someone was commenting about that, about Google making a lot of money on search advertising.

**Scott Thomas:** That was me. [Laughter.]

**Geoffrey Graybeal:** So if you look at Rupert Murdoch [who] is the most outspoken on this, he would argue that Google is adversarial and is making a lot of that money off the content that newspaper companies are creating. He has a lot of very strong rhetoric about this, saying that they're stealing our content. So that's the one issue, is that Google, of course, is aggregating.

The *Googles* of the world are aggregating and using search for advertising dollars, which newspapers on a local level... So first of all, they're taking newspaper content that they're making money off of, that's one issue. The other is that if you look at search and search advertising, it's certainly been very successful for the *Googles* of the world; however, the future advertising direction, if you talk to ad companies, is going to be in search. That's why Google is getting into the social realm with its purchase of YouTube. That's why you might have seen a study recently that Facebook surpassed Yahoo in terms of being one of the most visited sites. The future direction for advertising is going to be in search, because advertising companies want searches that are — buys that are measurable, trackable, all of those sort of things, so that they can show that there are results to those ad dollars. One of the issues or problems with the search algorithm that Google has, although it's been very successful, is it doesn't take into consideration the context that it's searching for. So I hate Duke University athletically, because I went to the University of North Carolina. I happen to work for Duke University in the summer, their temp program, so I get lots of emails in my inbox with Duke. So Google search is picking Duke as a term that is in my inbox and is giving me tons of advertisements toward Duke, which I despise athletically. They're the enemy. It's not taking that context, the algorithm. It's just picking my search words. I could say, "I hate Duke." It's picking up Duke and gives me that search. So with social advertising, you're seeing it more focused to presumably the content that you're targeting. I'm choosing to follow these brands. I'm choosing to follow yogurt shops in Athens, for example. I deliberately am opting into that. So from a brand standpoint, I think I would say that search is the future direction for advertising. I mean, not search. Social. Excuse me. And two, from the news standpoint, that's the point is that other companies are now making money off of our content that we're giving away for free.

**Scott Thomas:** Cool. I'll just say that I think it might be more—or it would be better if news companies looked in more dynamic forms of advertising, actually, [than] what you're talking about. Because at the end of the day, they wind up on our page, whether they got there through Google or not. But I wish you gentlemen luck, and if it works out, I will eat my words. So good luck to you.

**Geoffrey Graybeal:** Thank you for your comment.

**Iris Chyi:** Other questions?

**Rosental Calmon Alves:** Coffee?

**Iris Chyi:** Coffee break. [Laughter.] Thank you, all the presenters.

[Applause.]